

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 18-20, and 22 are cancelled.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify the invention. The invention is now claimed as a method for directing packetized data to a local network. The invention involves the use of packetized data that comports to hierarchical layers of communication protocols as described in the specification on page 3, lines 11-25, page 5, line 5 to page 6, line 15, Fig. 7, and in other places.

Claim 6 is amended to clarify the invention. The invention is now claimed as a method for directing IP data. The claimed IP data is structured in the form of hierarchical layers of communication protocols as described in the specification on page 3, lines 11-25, page 5, line 5 to page 6, line 15, Fig. 7, and in other places.

Claim 6 is also amended to clarify that the second layer protocol (MAC) address is determined when there is an IP address match, supporting the antecedent basis of "said second protocol layer (MAC) address determined in response to said address match".

Claim 21 is amended as to incorporate Claim 22.

Second numbered Claim 3 is renumbered as Claim 24.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Rejection

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant disagrees with this rejection.

Specifically, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24 as the specification fails to disclose, "how the method steps as recited in the claim combination are able to facilitate communication between different networks in a bi-directional communication system," (Office Action, page 2, second paragraph).

As amended, independent Claims 1, 6, and 21 claim a method for directing packetized or IP data. This term is more specific than the "communicating" term previously used in the preamble of such claims. The claimed directing of packetized or IP data is described in the specification on page 3, line 27 to page 4, line 31, page 9, line 25 to page 14, line 1, Fig. 1, and in other places.

Applicant requests the removal of this rejection to Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24 for the reasons listed above.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter in which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant disagrees with this rejection.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, and 24 where the scope of these claims was not clear. As amended, the scope of the claims is clarified as being a method for directing packetized data to a local network. Claims 21-23 are amended in a similar fashion.

The Examiner's rejection to Claim 6 states that provides there is no step recited for determining a MAC address. The amendment to the Claim 6 states that such a MAC address is determined when there is an IP address match.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 6-17 where the scope of the claims was not clear. As amended, the scope of the claims is clarified as being a method for directing IP data, wherein said IP data is structured in the form of hierarchical layers of communication protocols.

Applicant requests the removal of this rejection to Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24 for the reasons listed above.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slemmer et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,377,990, after referred to as 'Slemmer'). Applicant disagrees with this rejection.

Claim 1 claims a step of, "redirecting a payload of said received IP packet from an Internet network to said local network in response to said address match by; substituting a second protocol layer address for a received second protocol layer address." This substitution step is neither disclosed nor suggested in Slemmer.

The Examiner in the rejection cites to Slemmer as disclosing this claimed step. Slemmer discloses that each computer in a network makes use of "a unique IP address and a unique network adapter address associated with that computer," (Slemmer, col. 2, lines 62-24). The disclosed IP address and network adapter addresses exist on different protocol layers (Slemmer, col. 3, line 45 to col. 4, line 7).

Slemmer then describes an operation where upon the match of an IP address, server 12 replaces a, "destination IP address in the message with the foreign IP address," (see Slemmer, col 3, lines 20-28, and col. 5, lines 37-43). This replacement operation indicates that the Slemmer replaces the IP address located on one layer with an IP address in the same layer.

In contrast with the invention of Claim 1, in response to an IP address match where the IP packet destination address is "in a first protocol layer". The invention substitutes, "a second protocol layer address for a received second protocol layer address," in response to such a match. This substitution occurs in a second protocol layer, where the second protocol layer address is not an IP address. Slemmer only addresses a replacement of an IP address in a first protocol layer.

Moreover, Slemmer neither discloses or suggests the substitution of a second protocol layer address in response to an IP address match, as claimed in Claim 1.

Claims 6 claims that in response to an IP address match, "a payload of said received IP packet using said second protocol layer (MAC) address determined in response to said address match," is redirected. Slemmer, in contrast, discloses upon the match of an IP address, server 12 replaces a, "destination IP address in the message with the foreign IP address," (see

Slemmer, col. 3, lines 20-28, and col. 5, lines 37-43). This replacement operation indicates that the Slemmer replaces the IP address located on one layer with an IP address in the same layer. This is not the same as the claimed step of redirection in Claim 6.

Claim 9 claims "said redirecting step comprises substituting said second protocol layer (MAC) address for a received second protocol layer (MAC) address." This claimed step is neither disclosed nor suggested in Slemmer, for the reasons listed above explaining the operation of Slemmer.

Claim 21 claims a step of, "redirecting a payload of a received IP packet destined for said predetermined IP address, wherein said redirecting step substitutes a different MAC layer address for a received MAC layer address," when a domain name matches a predetermined entry in a domain name database. In contrast, Slemmer discloses upon the match of an IP address, server 12 replaces a, "destination IP address in the message with the foreign IP address," (see Slemmer, col 3, lines 20-28, and col. 5, lines 37-43). This replacement operation indicates that the Slemmer replaces the IP address located on one layer with an IP address in the same layer. This is not the same as the claimed step of redirection in Claim 21.

For the reasons listed above, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 6, 9, and 21 are patentable. Applicant also submits that Claims 2-5 and 24, Claims 7-8 and 10-17, and Claim 23 are patentable as such claims dependent on independent Claims 1, 6, and 21 respectively. Applicant requests the removal of the rejection to Claims 1-17, 21, and 23-24 for the reasons listed above.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Applicants request a Request for Continuing Examination (as indicating on a separate paper) and a request for a two-month extension in which to respond. The fee for the RCE and the requested two-month extension is to be charged to

deposit account 07-0832, as indicated in the fee sheet being submitted with this response. Any other fees that are owed in connection with this response are to be charged to deposit account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,


By: _____
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43, 613
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
February 28, 2005